

### **REMARKS**

Reexamination and reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. By this amendment, claim 1 is canceled. Claims 2, 8, 12, 13-18, 24 and 25 are amended. No new claims are added. After this amendment, claims 2-26 remain pending in the application. No new matter was added.

### **Allowed/Allowable Claims**

The Applicants want to acknowledge and thank the Examiner for indicating in the Office Action, dated June 13, 2007, that claims 2-7, 9-11 and 18-23 are allowed, and further that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all limitations of the respective independent claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, the Applicants have amended claim 13. Claim 13 is now in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim (claim 1) and any intervening claims (none).

The dependencies of claims 14, 15 and 16 have been changed to now be dependent upon newly independent claim 13. Because dependent claims recite all the limitations of the independent claim, it is believed, for at least this reason, that dependent claims 14, 15 and 16 also recite in allowable form. Allowance of dependent claims 14, 15 and 16, in addition to allowance of independent claim 13, is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112**

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 8, 12, 24 and 25, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention, is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to claims 8, 12, 24 and 25.

Each instance of insufficient antecedent basis that was identified by the Examiner was corrected, along with a few additional corrections regarding antecedent basis. The Applicants

believe that the rejection of claims 8, 12, 24 and 25, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been overcome. The Examiner should withdraw the rejection of these claims. Because claims 8, 12, 24 and 25 were not otherwise rejected, the Applicants believe that claims 8, 12, 24 and 25 are now allowable. Allowance of claims 8, 12, 24 and 25 is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103(a)**

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 14-17 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art Figure 3 in view of Riley (U.S. Patent No. 6,750,463) is respectfully requested in view of the cancellation of claim 1, the amendments to claims 14-17, and for the following reasons.

It is the Applicants' contention that neither Prior Art of Figure 3, nor the Riley reference, nor any combination thereof, teaches the presently claimed invention. Nevertheless, dependent claims 14, 15 and 16 should be allowed because they are now dependent upon amended independent claim 13, as discussed hereinabove. Claim 17 should be allowed because it has been amended to now include the following limitation, recited at the end of amended claim 17:

**“wherein said photon flux source comprises a light emitting diode, and  
wherein each of said first and second inhibiting means comprises a Schottky  
diode electrically coupled with said light emitting diode”.**

Neither Prior Art of Figure 3, nor the Riley reference, nor any combination thereof, teaches the above limitation.

Dependent claim 26 should be allowed without amendment because it depends upon amended claim 17, which should be allowed, as discussed immediately above.

Therefore, the Applicants believe that the the rejections of claims 1, 14-17 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art Figure 3 in view of Riley, has been overcome. The Examiner should withdraw the rejection of these claims. Allowance of claims 14-17 and 26 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

The foregoing is submitted as full and complete response to the Office Action mailed June 13, 2007, and, in view of the preceding discussion, it is submitted that claims 2-26 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 2-26 is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless the Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

**If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities that can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or that in any way would help expedite the prosecution of the patent application, a telephone call to the undersigned at (561) 989-9811 is respectfully solicited.**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account **50-1556**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2007

By:           /Jose Gutman/          

Jose Gutman  
Reg. No. 35,171

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN  
BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.  
551 N.W. 77th Street, Suite 111  
Boca Raton, FL 33487  
Tel (561) 989-9811  
Fax (561) 989-9812